REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.Rejection of claims 1 and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lee (2002/0064037) in view of Vollkommer et al. (6,853,124) and further in view of Park (2005/0127848):

Claim 1:

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Specifically, the limitation "the first electrodes and the second electrodes are exposed outside the frame" has been added to claim 1. This limitation finds support, for instance, in paragraph [0023] (lines 7-8) in the specification, and in Figs.3, 6 and 8. No new matter is introduced by this amendment.

Lee discloses a **dual sided display** having two display panels, however, Lee does not teach using external electrode fluorescent lamps. Vollkommer discloses using external electrode fluorescent lamps in a **single sided display**. Park teaches connecting the fluorescent lamps in parallel. The applicant believes the cited arts fail to teach all the limitations of claim 1 and explains as follows.

First, Lee does **not** teach using external electrode fluorescent lamps as the Examiners pointed out in the Office action, and the dual sided display that Lee discloses uses an **edge-lighting type back light**. The edge-lighting type backlight has **more space** in the peripheral region to accommodate the inverters. Lee does not disclose that it is required for an edge-lighting type back light to use EEFL. On the other hand, the back light module of claim 1 is **bottom-lighting type**, in which lamps are arranged between two panels. For a dual-side display in the present invention, the allocation of the inverters and the conducting wires becomes a problem to be solved. The dual sided display of Lee does not have the same problem of accommodating the inverters as the back light

module of claim 1. In addition, Vollkommer teaches using external electrode fluorescent lamps, but he installs the EEFL in a **single sided display**, instead of a dual sided display.

Since Lee does not teach or suggest using EEFL, and Vollkommer fails to teach or suggest using EEFL in a dual sided display, the back light module of claim 1 is distinct. In addition, neither Lee nor Vollkommer faces the same problem of accommodating the inverters of lamps (CCFLs) as the present application, and it would not been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the dual display of Lee with EEFL of Vollkommer.

In addition, the amended claim 1 includes the limitation "the first electrodes and the second electrodes are exposed outside the frame", and none of the cited art has disclosed this limitation. Therefore, the inverter may electrically connect to the electrodes of the EEFL without applying any wires passing through the frame for connecting the inverter and the electrodes of the EEFL. The amended claim 1 should be allowed. Reconsideration of claim 1 is politely requested.

Claims 6-8:

Claim 8 has been amended, and this limitation does not introduce new matter. Claims 6-8 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claims 6-8 is politely requested.

2.Rejection of claims 2-5 under 35 U.S.C 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lee, Vollkommer, Park in view ofr Shibata (5,648,858):

Claims 2-5:

Claims 2-5 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claims 2-5 is politely requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,

5

Winston Hsu Date: July 19, 2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562
10 Facsimile: 806-498-6673
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)